IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 15660 of 2005

Between:

1. V.Sandhya, D/o.Yellaiah,
   r/o H.Nagar, Wyra village & Mandal,

Khammam District.

2. M.Rajesh, S/o.Anand Rao,
   R/o.Vijayanagar Colony,

Khanapuram Haveli, Khammam.

3. N.Sailaja, D/o.Venkateswarlu,
   R/o.M.Venkaiayapalem, Khammam

Rural Mandal, Khammam District.

4. D.Kavitha, D/o.Srinivasa Reddy,
   R/o.Lenin Nagar, Burhanpuram,

Khammam.

5. D.Manohar, S/o.Gangulu,

Near Kalimatha Temple, Pilot Colony,

Manugur, Khammam District.

... PETITIONERS

AND

1. A.P.State Council for Higher Education,

Saifabad, Hyderabad, rep by its Secretary.

2. The Convenor, EDCET 2004-05,

O/o Director of School Education,

Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

3. The District Educational Officer,

Khammam District at Khammam.

4. St.Lawrence College of education,

Khammam, rep. by its Correspondent.

....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR.N.SRIDHAR REDDY
Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR EDUCATION

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed by the petitioners, who are 5 in number, aggrieved by the in action of the second respondent in not considering their cases for allotment of B.Ed., seats in the 4th respondent college.

2. According to the petitioners they have appeared for the Ed.CET Examination and secured ranks and in pursuance of the notification they have made their applications by paying challans of Rs.300/- each on 14.05.2005 within the prescribed time and applied to the 4th respondent college. However, the grievance of the petitioners is that their applications were not forwarded to the District Educational Officer and consequently their cases were not considered for allotment of B.Ed., seats in the 4th respondent college. Therefore, the petitioners made representation to the 3rd respondent and the 3rd respondent by proceedings dated 22.06.2005 referred the cases of the petitioners to the 2nd respondent-the Convenor, Ed.CET 2004-2005. But however, the 2nd respondent did not take any action and no orders are passed

either directing the 4th respondent to admit the petitioners or even rejecting their cases if they are not eligible for getting admission. In the absence of any action on the part of 2nd respondent the petitioners have come up with the present writ petition.

3. This Court on 19.07.2005 directed the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents to get instructions. The learned Government Pleader appearing for the official respondents stated that the petitioners have not made their applications within the time prescribed, therefore, they are not eligible for being considered. But, however, no material is placed before this Court.

4. Heard both sides and considered the material on record.

5. As it is claimed by the petitioners that they have made their applications well within the time and in fact the challans paid by way of demand drafts bears the date of 14th May, 2005, it is difficult to reject the claim of the petitioners as they have made applications well within the time and they have paid challans on 14.05.2005 itself. Further, when the petitioners made representation to the 3rd respondent, the 3rd respondent, in fact, referred the matter to the 2nd respondent. Even then also the 2nd respondent did not move his little finger.

6. Under the above circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to consider the claim of the petitioners, if necessary, by calling required application which the petitioners are claiming to have presented before the 4th respondent, and pass appropriate orders expeditiously, preferably within ten days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. The writ petition is accordingly, disposed of. No costs.

S.ANANDA REDDY,J

Date: 25th July 2005.

Note:

Issue CC in two days.

//B.O.//

BSB